

REMARKS

Claims 25, 27, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 22, 30, 33, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as unpatentable over Wolfberg.

Claims 23 to 25, 34, 35, 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wolfberg in view of Sturtz and Littleton. Claims 26 to 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wolfberg et al. in view of Sauer, Sturtz, and Littleton.

Claims 25, 27, 29 and 30 have been amended. Claims 31, 32 and 39 have been canceled without prejudice.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested based on the following comments.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 25, 27, 29 and 30 have been amended to clarify indefiniteness and antecedent basis issued. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 22, 30, 33, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as unpatentable over Wolfberg.

Wolfberg discloses drums 112, 116, 108, 106 for cutting business forms, disposed to carry blades. (see col. 8, line 55 et seq.) The blades are described as engaging the web, but no mention is made of the drums nipping the web.

In fact, the web of Wolfberg is moved via drive rollers at the periphery of the web as clearly indicated by the holes in Wolfberg and as shown in Fig. 9.

Claim 22 recites “a first anvil cylinder having a first anvil cylinder nipping surface extending circumferentially about the first anvil cylinder;

the first cutting cylinder nipping surface and the first anvil cylinder nipping surface providing a first nip for the web about the first segmented cutting blade.”

Claims 33 and 36 have similar limitations.

Wolfberg does not teach or disclose provide a first nip for the web about the first segmented cutting blade.

In fact, since Wolfberg uses drive rollers at the periphery to move the web, it teaches away from nipping the web.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 23 to 25, 34, 35, 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wolfberg in view of Sturtz and Littleton. Claims 26 to 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wolfberg et al. in view of Sauer, Sturtz, and Littleton.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art cited in addition to Wolfberg would not have rendered the following claim limitation obvious: “a first anvil cylinder having a first anvil cylinder nipping surface extending circumferentially about the first anvil cylinder;

the first cutting cylinder nipping surface and the first anvil cylinder nipping surface providing a first nip for the web about the first segmented cutting blade.”

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and applicant respectfully requests such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:  _____

William Gehris
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940